

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

ALLEN L. LUECK,

Plaintiff,

v.

LA CROSSE COUNTY, KEITH BACK, DENNIS  
OSGOOD, TIM HAMMES, STEVE O'MALLEY,  
ROBERT TAUNT, DAVIN LANGE, TIM GRUENKE,  
and TARA JOHNSON,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

18-cv-40-jdp

Allen L. Lueck, appearing pro se, has filed this lawsuit in which he states that various defendants, including La Crosse County, county highway officials, and the district attorney, retaliated against him and wrongfully terminated him. I dismissed Lueck's original complaint because his allegations did not comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8; the complaint and attached supplement contained virtually no information about Lueck's job, who fired him, or how any of the defendants retaliated against him. *See* Dkt. 4. I gave Lueck a chance to file an amended complaint that explained the basic background facts about his employment and termination, and how each of the defendants violated his rights.

Lueck has filed a document in response to the order that I construe as another supplement to the complaint. Dkt. 5. In it he lists each of the defendants, their jobs, and some facts about how he believes each of them acted to harm him. But his allegations are still not fully understandable. I take Lueck to be saying that he worked for La Crosse County and was a union representative, and that he was fired by Assistant Highway Commissioner Keith Back after he was falsely accused of lying to a police officer. But Lueck does not explain why someone

fabricated this accusation, or whether it had anything to do with his status as a union representative or any other reason that might be grounds for a lawsuit.

So I will dismiss Lueck's supplement because it also violates Rule 8. But I will give him a final chance to submit an amended complaint that explains the reasons he thinks that defendants violated his rights. He should file a brand-new complaint that includes all the allegations he wants the court to consider, and that will replace all of the documents he has filed so far—it would not be fair to defendants to force them to cobble together his original complaint and three supplements to determine what he is trying to say. I will attach a copy of this court's complaint form to assist Lueck in drafting an amended complaint.

Lueck should draft his amended complaint as if he were telling a story to people who know nothing about his situation. In particular, he should explain the basic background facts about his employment and termination. He should explain what he did that he believes caused defendants to retaliate against him, and what he believes was the true reason that he was fired. He should also explain what each of the defendants had to do with that termination or other retaliation.

I will give Lueck a short time to submit an amended complaint that fixes the problems discussed above. If he does not submit an amended complaint by the deadline set below, I will dismiss the case.

## ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Allen L. Lueck's supplement to the complaint, Dkt. 5, is DISMISSED for failure to comply with the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. He may have

until October 2, 2018, to submit an amended complaint that fixes the problems discussed above.

Entered September 11, 2018.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

JAMES D. PETERSON  
District Judge